

REMARKS:

Claims 1 through 12 rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been cancelled.

Claim 13 remains in this application but has been amended so as to more clearly point out the features of distinction from the prior art.

While the Examiner has rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103, there is no mention whatever in the remarks of the Examiner of this claim or its features. The Examiner has not pointed in any way to any disclosure in any one of the six references cited which show the features of this claim.

Yet further careful consideration of each of the six references included in the 103 rejection does not disclose any die having a movement of the path now clearly defined in this claim. Thus the Examiner will note that in Claim 13 it clearly specifies that the die parts move initially in a direction to bring the mating surfaces of the die parts together but with the axes of the two part cylindrical surfaces offset in a direction at right angles to the axes, and then the die parts are moved parallel to the mating surfaces and along the direction of offset so as to bring the two part cylindrical surfaces together to form the cylindrical die shape.

Simply this arrangement is not disclosed in the prior art and it is not understood whether the Examiner has any objection under 35 U.S.C. 103 and if so on what basis this rejection is raised. It is submitted therefore that Claim 13 together with its dependent Claims 14 through 18 are properly distinguished from the prior art and therefore should be allowable.

Claim 19 is also rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103 but again there is no mention in the remarks of the Examiner of the features of this claim. In particular Claim 19 is directed to an arrangement in which the mating surfaces on one side of the part

cylindrical surfaces are parallel to but spaced from the mating surfaces on the opposite side of the part cylindrical surfaces. This construction is shown clearly in for example Figure 7 of the application where the mating surfaces are indicated at 60A and 60B on one side of the part cylindrical surfaces forming the cylindrical die 62 and on the other side the mating surfaces are indicated at 60C and 60D and it is clear that these are parallel to the surfaces 60A and 60B but offset relative thereto.

Again this construction is not mentioned by the Examiner and is not shown in any of the six prior art references raised by the Examiner. It is believed therefore that this claim and its dependent Claims 20 and 21 are in good order for allowance.

Further and favourable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

RANDEL BRANDSTROM

PER: 

Michael R. Williams

Registration No: 45,333

ADB/II
April 14, 2004
Enc.(2)

Adrian D. Battison

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Telephone (204) 947-1429 - FAX (204) 942-5723

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

LYNN LEATHERDALE

Lynn Leatherdale

DATE: April 14/04